United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

ORIGINAL

4-2319

United States Court of Appeals

For the Second Circuit.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Appellee,

FRANK BREEN,

Appellant.

ON APPEAU FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Appellant's Appendix

THEODORE KRIEGER Attorney for Appellant 401 Broadway New York, N.Y. 10013 (212) WO 6-5911

Dick Balley Printers * P.O.-Box X, Staten Island, N.V. 10302 * Tel.: (212) 447 5358



PAGINATION AS IN ORIGINAL COPY

INDEX TO APPENDIX

Minutes of Hearing Al

1	THE CLERK: Eight pages of letters marked				
l/lam 2 H3/dl	Government's Exhibit 52 for Identification.				
, 3	Criminal cause on trial, United States of				
4	America against Frank Breene and John Indiviglio.				
5	THE COURT: Both sides ready?				
6	MR. WEINTRAUB: Ready, your Honor.				
.7	MR. KRIEGER: Ready, your Honor.				
8	MR. WEINTRAUB: The Government calls Officer				
9	Schmidt.				
10	JAMES SCHM.IDT, having been first duly				
11	sworn by the Clerk of the Court, testified as				
12	follows:				
13	THE CLERK: State your full name for the				
14	record and spell it, please.				
15	THE WITNESS: James Schmidt, S-c-h-m-i-d-t.				
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION				
17	BY MR. WEINTRAUB:				
18	Q Officer Schmidt, by whom are you employed?				
19	A The Incorporated Village of Northport Police				
20	Department.				
21	Q How long have you been employed there?				
22	A Six years.				
23	Q In what capacity?				
24	A As a patrolman.				
25	Q Where do you live?				

I live in East Northport.

1	Q	Are you acquainted on a social basis with an			
2	individual named Frank Breene?				
3		Yes.			
4	0	Do you see him in Court?			
5	A	Yes.			
6		MR. KRIEGER: Conceded.			
7	Q	Did you have occasion to see Mr. Breene in			
8	May of 1974 during that month?				
9	A	Approximately around there, yes.			
10	0	Tell us the circumstances?			
11		I had occasion to go into the City to pick him			
12	up from a bar	somewhere around 8th Avenue. I don't recall the			
13	name.				
14	Ω	How did you happen to go pick him up?			
15	. A	I was out there where my in-laws work and the			
16	phone rang an	d it was Mr. Breene			
17		MR. KRIEGER: May I sit a little closer?			
18		THE COURT: Yes.			
19	Q	Try to speak up.			
20		You received a phone call from Mr. Breene?			
21	A	The bar itself received a call and I answered			
22	国际国际企业工程的企业工程	he said he was pretty well under the weather			
23	and needed a r	ride out and I went out to pick him up.			
24	Q	Did you have a conversation with him?			
25		Yes, I did.			
	0.	Would you tell us the substance of the			

In the bar on 8th Avenue. A

Where you came to pick up Mr. Breene?

425

Right.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Will you tell us what you said to him and what he said to you?

Well, it was a regular conversation for awhile and then Mr. Breene stated: "You know, they are trying to put e away for 20 years."

At that time I didn't know what he was talking about. I just said, "Yeah." I thought he was bombed.

He said, "They found the 350,000 but there was another 90,000 in the trunk of the car."

I said, "What car?" And the conversation ended.

Q He didn't respond to that?

Yes.

You weren't aware that he was under indictment by the Federal Government for a narcotics violation at that ime?

> A No, sir.

> > MR. WEINTRAUB: I have no further questions.

MR. KRIEGER: May I have your Honor's

indulgence for a moment?

THE COURT: You are claiming this is an in custody statement?

A3

24

25

MR. KRIEGER: No -- I withdraw that. I reserve whatever rights might accrue to my client insofer as a non-custodial admission without the giving of the Miranda rights.

My fundamental thrust is the voluntariness of the purported statement.

THE COURT: I think that is a statement of fact for the jury.

I do not know how drunk he was. I do not know how much he had control over the statements he made, but we are talking about a non-custodial statement.

MR. KRIEGER: Under Jackson v. Denno, the rule is paramount. The question of voluntariness must be initially determined by the Court.

THE COURT: I understand that. I do not doubt that. The thing I am wondering about is what the real issue is, whether he was so drunk that he didn't know what he was saying.

MR. KRIEGER: Therefore, any statement would not be voluntary.

THE COURT: I understand.

I can tell from the context of the conversation that he knew enough about what was happening so he understood what he was saying.

Mind you, that he talks about 350,000 dollars

3

5

7

8

9

11

13

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

found and that Matteo was shot and there was 90,000 more in the trunk.]

MR. KRIEGER: There was nothing about Matteo being shot.

THE COURT: But \$90,000 more in the trunk of the car.

All right, go ahead.

MR. KRIEGER: All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: When you say that before he made those statements you talked about other things, tell us what other things you talked about and whether he was logical in your own mind.

THE WITNESS: We shot a game of pool.

THE COURT: At the bar?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Was he steady?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Did you complete the entire rate?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: More than one rack?

THE WITNESS: No, sir, one game.

THE COURT: Are you a good pool player?

THE WITNESS: Not as good as Mr. Breene.

THE COURT: How did you do that day?

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: I beat him.

THE COURT: How did you beat him?

THE WITNESS: I ran the table on him.

THE COURT: Could he hold a cue?

THE WITNESS: YES, sir.

THE COURT: What else did you talk about?

THE WITNESS: Just general, your know, how are you doing, what's happening, and that type of thing.

THE COURT: Any question about his recognition of you?

THE WITNESS: No, sir, we have known each other for about 8 months.

THE COURT: Was the conversation in point or did he wander?

THE WITNESS: I guess you could say he wandered a little bit.

We were talking about something else and this came in and at that time I didn't have the slightest idea what he was talking about. I just thought it was mumble.

THE COURT: Did he go to your car?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I drove him back to the Island.

THE COURT: Did he have to be helped to get into the car?

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Did he do any drinking while he was with you?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

THE COURT: What was he drinking?

THE WITNESS: I really don't remember.

THE COURT: Was it hard liquor or beer?

THE WITNESS: I believe it was Scotch. I was drinking the same thing.

THE COURT: Did he tell you how much he had had before?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Did he tell you how long he had been at the bar?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. KRIEGER:

Q At the outset, Officer, is it your testimony that somebody at the bar called you up and asked you to look after Mr. Breene?

- A No, sir.
- Q Who called you?
- A Mr. Breene called the bar where my in-laws

10

11

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

25

work on the island. I was there. I answered the phone.

Q He asked you to come out and get him because he couldn't get home?

A He said he was drinking -- there was no trains and he had been drinking. I told him to stay put and that I'd go out and get him.

THE COURT: Was that true that there were no trains?

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

THE COURT: What time was this?

THE WITNESS: Around 11:00, 12:00 o'clock at night.

THE COURT: What part of the island was he trying to get to?

THE WITNESS: Northport.

THE COURT: That would be interesting to know how well oriented he was, whether there was really no trains or whether he was imagining this.

Why don't you get me a Long Island Railroad schedule.

- Q You then drove from Northport into the City to pick him up?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q What time did you get into the bez?

				4
• 1			Schmidt - cross	431
2		A	Estimating about 12:30, 1:00 o'clock	in that
3	area.			
4		Q	How long did it take you to get from	Northport
5	to the !	bair?		
6		A	Forty minutes.	
7		Q	Where was the bar?	
8		A	It's on Main Street in the Village of	Northport
9	the bar	I left	from or	
10		Q	The bar he was in?	
11		A	8th Avenue on 48th or 42nd.	
12			Mr. Breene gave me directions on the	phone. I
13	don't re	call.		
14			THE COURT: Did he give you the direct	tions on
15		the pho	one or did you know where the place wa	s ?
16			THE WITNESS: He told me where the pl	ace was.
17		I didn'	t know nothing about the place, sir.	
18		Q	What exactly did he say to you when h	e called
19	you up?			
20		λ	Just about what I told you, he was tr	
21	get out	to the	island. He had been drinking, he cou	ldn't get
22	a train	, and I	told him to stay put, that I'd come i	n and
23	get him			

Did he tell you the location of the bar?

Yes.

24

25

22

23

24

25

Q	What	did	he	tell	you?

- A That it was -- I go down the Long Island

 Expressway, to the Midtown Tunnel, go on Second Avenue -- I

 don't recall exactly --
 - Q Did he give you the location of the bar?
- A Yes, Eighth Avenue and 48th Street. It was fresh in my mind then. I don't recall now.
- Q All right, when you got there did you see Breene?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q And where was he when you first saw him?
- A He was sitting at the bar when I walked into the bar.
 - Q Did he have a drink in his immediate presence?
- A Whether it was in his hand, I don't recall, but he had been drinking.
- Q He not only had been drinking, but there was whiskey right within his immediate presence, either in his hand --

THE COURT: Mr. Breene, you'll have to spend a lot of time. I believe he was drinking.

MR. KRIEGER: Very well.

THE COURT: It doesn't matter much that this police officer saw him take a few extra drinks.

Let us not spend a lot of time on irrelevant matters.

How drunk only Mr. Breene can tell me. If he can tell me, maybe he wasn't so drunk.

MR. KRIEGER: If your Honow has made a determination that Breene was drunk, I am going to argue from that. I won't have any further questioning.

THE COURT: What does drunk mean? That he didn't have full coordination? Of course not. He couldn't play a full game of pool and Police Officer Schmidt beat him at a rack of pool. That is some evidence that he didn't have full coordination.

Was he able to think? Was he able to call

Mr. Schmidt? Did he know where he was? Did he know

where he usually worked? Did he give him directions

to get to the bar? Does that show a thinking process?

The mere fact someone doesn't have his full coordination does not mean he is not sware of what he is saying.

I do not know what drunk means, because I happen not to be a drinker, but I have spoken to people that professed to be drunk and they could speak -- sometimes with a little difficulty -- but what they said made sense.

Does being drunk mean that you are not aware

•

:

of what you are saying?

Maybe you are a better expert than I am. I do not know. Looking at you, I cannot tell.

(continued next page.)

MR. KRIEGER: Judge, I do not drink either, but this is the first time that I had to probably state that I regret it. I might be more expert on it. The issue is not the effect of inebriation as such, save as to how it affects the ability of one accused of a serious crime to voluntarily make an admission and the only issue is of the voluntariness under those circumstances, whether the extent of the inebriation was such that anything that he said was the babbling of a mind that had been clouded by alcohol.

THE COURT: How many drinks did you see him take?

THE WITNESS: I would say we were in the bar for approximately 45 minutes to an hour, maybe three.

THE COURT: Three over the period of 45 minutes to an hour?

THE WITNESS: That's an estimate.

THE COURT: All right, anything else?

MR. KRIEGER: Yes, I would like to complete my examination if I can, your Honor.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. KRIEGER: (cont.)

Q When was this alleged statement made with respect to that period of 45 minutes -- at the beginning?

A I would say it was more in the middle.

A13

24

25

More in the middle. During the period of time Q that you were there, how many dranks did you have? Three, four. And had you had anything to drink that night?

Yes, I just walked into the bar at Northport. I had a drink out there, too.

When did you first report this purported conversation?

I had occasion to speak with a Lieutenant John Thompson approximately three weeks ago, I guess, and we got discussing this case and it turned out that I knew the same subject and that is how one thing led to the other.

You did not report this conversation to any law Q enforcement authority for a period of some five or six weeks?

That's correct.

And naturally you have no notation as to this --Q didn't make any report as to it?

A No, sir, I didn't know anything was involved.

And you didn't make any arrest of Mr. Breene? Q

No.

And is it your testimony that you had never Q known of his legal difficulties, sofar as this matter is concerned, until he had divulged it to you that night?

Yes -- no, I did not know and even after he

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

said that, I didn't realise what it was all about.

- Q Isn't it a fact that he had been living with your in-laws?
 - A He had spent some time there.
- Q Isn't it a fact that you and he were out socially a good deal?
 - A We ran across each other, yes.
- Q Isn't it a fact that the sociability extended to the fact that you had loaned him your camper -- your trailer?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q Isn't it a fact that you told your in-laws that they shouldn't spend any time with Mr. Breene?
- A After I realized the involvement -- after I had spoken with two agents, I recommended that they not associate with him.
 - Q That would have been just a month ago?
 - A That's when it was.
- Q Now, you had told Agent Valdi that Breene was obviously drinking to excess, had you not?
 - A Yes, I did.
- Q And is it your testimony here this morning that he still was "obviously drinking to excess?"
 - A Yes, sir.

3

5

.

7

8

_

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: In your opinion, was he well-oriented as to time and place?

Did he know where he was?

THE WITHESS: He knew where he was as far as time goes -- the man was bombed -- he was drunk.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KRIEGER: I have nothing further.

MR. WEINTRAUB: No further questions.

THE COURT: You may step down.

MR. KRIEGER: I rest on the record and submit that any purported statement was not voluntary. The man was not in any condition to make any statement which would warrant or rise to the dignity of an admission being submitted to this Court and even have a jury deliberate thereon.

THE COURT: Are you willing to rest on the witnesses' testimony? You said that Mr. Breene was going to testify -- yesterday that was your representation.

MR. WEINTRAUB: That is correct.

MR. KRIEGER: May I have your Honor's indulgence for a second?

THE COURT: As a matter of fact, it is uncertain as to how this goes.

This is your objection and some cases say you

must show first some basis for the objection and then the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that it was voluntary.

MR. KRIEGER: That may be academic.

May I have your Honor's indulgence for a second? (Recess taken.)

MR. KRIEGER: If your Honor pleases, in light of the report which had been furnished me and in light of this witness' testimony, I rest.

of Police Officer James Schmidt, I find that the defendant called Police Officer Schmidt and told him he had been drinking, told him where he was, advised him how to get there from Northport, told him that he couldn't get back to Northport because there were no trains scheduled, and there is no reason to believe that was erroneous and the defendant hasn't offered any proof that this was just an illusion of his or a misjudgment of some kind attributable to the drinking.

The fact that they both consumed three extra ounces, I assume, of a hard liquor over a period of 45 minutes, leads me to believe that this defendant was fully aware of what he was saying. He must have been oriented as to time and place, because he called the

police officer, told him where he was, gave him all the other information which apparently turned out to be correct. His coordination was somehow impaired by the liquor, but that does not mean that his thinking process was impaired to the same degree and so I find that the defendant Breene knowingly and voluntarily made the statement in which he in effect said, "I am in trouble, they are trying to put me away for 20 years. They found \$350,000 and there was \$90,000 more in the trunk of the car."

You have an exception.

MR. KRIEGER: Thank you, sir.

One, could we have a resolution with respect to
Suffolk County -- Massau County Grand Jury testimony

as to Mrs. Somas?

What is the situation on that -- the Suffolk County rather?

MR. WEINTRAUB: I represented to Mr. Krieger that we'd attempt to get that Grand Jury testimony if in fact the District Attorney in Nassau County advised us that it had relation to this case or to Mrs. Somas' testimony to be more precise.

I really didn't have the manpower or the time

STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF RICHMOND) ROBERT BAILEY, being duly sworn, deposes and says, that deponent is not a party to the action, is over 18 years of age and resides at 286 Richmond Avenue, Staten Island, N.Y. 10302. That on the 20 day of upon the address designated by said attorney(s) for that purpose by depositing 3 true copies of same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper, in an official depository under the exclusive care and custody of the United States post office department within the State of New York. Sworn to before me, this WILLIAM BAILEY Notary Public, State of New York No. 43-0132945 **Qualified in Richmond County** Commission Expires March 30, 1976

